

Compass Advisory Team Meeting
 Best Western, Stevens Point
 November 13, 2001

Attendees: Joe Hollister – Transportation District 3
 Jerry Kast – Monroe County
 Mike Ostrenga – Transportation District 8
 Brian Gaber – Transportation District 7
 Alison S. Lebwahl – Compass Program Manger
 John Kinar – Bureau of Highway Operations
 Tom Kochanski – Transportation District 2
 Matt Rauch – Bureau of Highway Operations
 Scott Schnacky – Bureau of Highway Operations
 Jack Yates – Marquette County
 Tom Walther – Eau Claire County
 Anne Monks – Division of Transportation Districts
 John Nordbo – Compass Meeting Facilitator – (OODS)
 Don Hartman – Videographer
 Cathy Meinholz – notes

Present in our hearts: Gary Kennedy – Manitowoc County

Topic	Discussion and Decisions
I. Where we've been	
<p>timeline</p>	<p>Alison gave an overview of the day's schedule. She provided us with a review of what's happened since July, along with the pilot timeline, standards team efforts, training and ratings. Highlights included:</p> <p>Compass Pilot Products: Recommendations for a statewide program that works for Wisconsin Buy-in from critical DOT employees and partners</p> <p>Pilot Timeline Overview: <i>Compass Kicks Off – June 28</i> <i>A-Team Shapes Program – July 10 – 11</i> <i>S-Team Creates Standards – July 18 –19</i> <i>Rating Manual – August & September</i> <i>Training Development – August & September</i> <i>S-Team Trains Ratings Team – October 2 –3</i> <i>R-Team Rates the Roads – October 4 –25</i></p> <p>What's Next? <i>Reports Issued – November</i> <i>Pilot Concludes – January 2002</i> <i>Evaluation – October - December</i></p>

	All took time to review the materials in their binders.
Ratings	<p>Training: Alison reported that the training went well. She handed out a copy of Deb Laurel's recommendations for future Compass rater training.</p> <p>John Kinar mentioned that some teams questioned why there were asked to go to other counties to do "quality assurance."</p> <p>Note: Future communication and training will need to emphasize the reason for QA checks.</p>
Prioritization tool	<p>The prioritization tool shows what percentage of each activity is spent addressing each of four maintenance objectives: safety, preservation of investment, comfort & convenience, aesthetics. These percentages were derived by asking the Standards Team members what percentage of each feature contributed to each of these objectives, and what percentage of time in each activity was spent on each feature.</p> <p>Alison suggested the chart may be more valuable with labor hours in it. For each activity, we should include total cost, total labor costs, labor as a percentage of total cost. John Kinar suggested adding 1) total cost associated with a feature and 2) percentage of time spent on each of the four objectives for each feature.</p> <p>Decision: Ask the standards team to flag which activities contribute to the objectives in a way that is discrete by hours spent, so that if 10% of the time spent in that activity is spent on aesthetics, a 10% reduction could be designed to affect only aesthetics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <u>The Standards Team recommendation subgroup</u> will make this part of their recommendations. <p>The group revisited the Florida definitions for safety, aesthetics, comfort and convenience and preservation of investment.</p> <p>Post-meeting note from Alison: The Standards Team did have the definitions of the four maintenance objectives in front of them when they did their work in July. The definitions used were those that follow, as agreed to by this group earlier that same month:</p> <p>Safety (45%) Highway features and characteristics that protect users against - and provide them with a clear sense of freedom from - danger, injury or damage.</p> <p>Preservation of Investment (30%) Actions taken to help a highway element obtain its full potential service life.</p> <p>Comfort and Convenience (15%) Highway features and characteristics, such as ride quality, proper signing, lack of obstructions, that provide a state of ease and quiet enjoyment for highway users.</p> <p>Aesthetics (10%) The display of natural or fabricated beauty items, such as</p>

	<p>landscaping or decorative structures, located along a highway corridor. Also, the absence of things like litter and graffiti, that detract from the sightliness of the road.</p> <p>Decision: Make sure the Standards Team has these definitions in front of them when they revisit their distribution of how much each feature contributes to these objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>The Standards Team recommendation subgroup</u> will make this part of their recommendations. ○ <u>Alison</u> will include these definitions in their materials. <p>The group discussed whether mobility should be a separate maintenance objective.</p> <p>Decision: Mobility does not need to be a separate component, as the program now exists. For now, we will stay with the four objectives we have. Once Winter Maintenance is part of the program, then we will want to include mobility.</p> <p>Recommended: Take the word “tool” off of the chart – replace with “summary.”</p> <p>Decision: Create weights for each of the activities by multiplying the percentage of each activity spent on each objective with the weight given to each objective by the Advisory Team in its July meeting. Then display the activities in descending order (high to low).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Alison</u> will do this. <p>Decision: Have the Standards Team determine which activities need a narrative to explain the impact of reductions in spending. Ask them to create that narrative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>The Standards Team recommendation subgroup</u> will make this part of their recommendations. <p>Decision: Add total dollars spent on each activity to the matrix (Use the \$ figures from behind tab 8 from the July meeting). Note: The group cautioned that we need to be sure that we compare “apples to apples” when doing this. It was agreed that as an Asset Management program we need to include LET work and DOT staff costs.</p>
<p>II. Where we’re going</p>	
<p>Pilot Reports:</p>	<p>Alison emphasized that these reports will be key to selling the Compass Program because they will illustrate the kinds of information that the data can be used to gather.</p>

	<p>It was initially thought that these reports would go to a wide audience for feedback. After some discussion, however, the group decided to send them out to a more targeted group.</p> <p>Decision: The reports will be sent to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Advisory Team with a form for feedback • Standards Team with a form for feedback • Ratings Team with a form for feedback • SPO Managers, presented at – or possibly in advance of – our meeting with them to present our findings and draft recommendations from the pilot • Dave Vieth for in-person feedback
<p>Data reporting</p>	<p>Cathy passed around a first draft of a ratings report, as well as some print-outs of the data that showed averages, standard deviations, and number of observations.</p> <p>Alison emphasized that the data from the pilot should not be used to evaluate maintenance conditions. The pilot did what it was supposed to in flushing out difficulties in rating and training, and these difficulties are reflected in expected inconsistencies and flaws in this initial set of data. These learnings will be incorporated into future rating and training design.</p> <p>The group recommended making several changes to the ratings report.</p> <p>Decisions: There will be a summary report, with more technical information attached in an appendix. Reports should show not only information we have now, but information we could have in the future, e.g., targets, past years. The reports will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statewide average • District average • Add a running bar chart along the bottom with gap between the target and actual • Weights for features and elements • Chart with top priorities on top • Chart with largest gaps on top • For non-valid features, n/a and count • The summary chart will not show the standard deviation, we will put it in higher level reports in appendices along with an explanation • The appendix will have standard deviation

<p>Work Plan</p>	<p>Task: <u>Define/compile time and dollar resources</u>, based on pilot. Incorporate into resource model. The incorporation into the resource model will likely involve a redefinition of work that is currently being done in other ways to say that now we do this work by rating the roads. Owners: <u>Brian, Alison and Scott</u></p> <p>Task: <u>Compile anecdotal results of ratings</u>, using the statements made at the October 30 debrief of the ratings team. Owner: <u>Alison</u></p> <p>The group agreed on the need to verify that there is no duplication of effort, and to explore other ways of gathering the data we need. In order to do this, we will have one group look at pavement data and another group look at other data, to be defined.</p> <p>Task: Recommend whether this program should continue gathering <u>pavement data</u> in its current fashion. Do this by a) determining what factors we should use to evaluate different ways of getting information on pavement (e.g., timeliness of data, relevance for maintenance, consistency, reliability, etc.) b) talking to other states to find out what they do, and c) locating and evaluating different data sources within the organization, including the pavement van and the computer program built by Paulette Hanna. Owners: <u>Alison, Brian and Mike</u></p> <p>Task: Review and recommend what data can be gathered on features from <u>other databases</u>, e.g., SIMS, culvert databases, etc. List and assess other data sources. Owners: <u>Matt, Tom K. and Brian</u></p> <p>Task: <u>Assess IT</u> criteria and options, taking into account OIS, BAS, etc. Owners: <u>Alison, Scott, Brian</u></p> <p>Task: <u>Recommend</u> what <u>other data</u> should be gathered on each segment, e.g., road class, photolog mile marker, and whether it can be extrapolated from other sources or the raters need to enter it. Owners: <u>Matt, Tom K. and Brian</u></p> <p>Task: Make <u>recommendations to the standards team</u> about the format and substance of their final recommendations based on feedback from the Ratings Team, management needs, and the need to be consistent across elements. Helpful resources for this group may include: Ed Kazik, Jerry Jagmin & Burt Ottman, because these folks were part of both the Standards Team and the Ratings Team, and Ed & Jerry delivered the training. Owners: <u>John, Jack, Tom W.</u></p> <p>Task: Develop an <u>Activities x Features Matrix</u> with grades and dollars</p>
-------------------------	---

spent. This matrix should grow out of the prioritization tool, and should incorporate recommendations/decisions discussed earlier.

Owner: Alison

Task: For DTD and others, develop a simple explanation of the program's mechanism, benefits & costs, with pictures and charts, 2-3 pages of text, appendices with more detail. This explanation will include much of the work done above, and will be presented to the SPO Managers as part of seeking their feedback, as well as create a basis for our final presentation to the DTD management team. Note: The Districts will ask: What will I get out of this? What will it cost me?

Owners: Alison, Anne and Joe

Task: Because the number of observations for some features is below 25, the average for those features cannot be said to be statistically valid. Thus, we need to address the following questions:

- Do we want statistically valid data for every feature on the county level? (Note that if we choose not to have this for features within an element, we no longer have valid data for that element.)
- If so, how do we go about doing that?
- If not which ones, if any, should we gather extra observations for? How would we do this?
- Should statistically invalid data be reported at all?

We can look at the current number of observations from the pilot and see which features we do not have valid data on the county level. We can also talk to other states. Note: districts will want reports to tell them if they are "gaining" or "losing" on their system. All information should be statistically valid on the district level.

Owners: Alison and John

Task: We need to more systematically incorporate the voice of the customer in this program. Where are the opportunities to do this? What are other states doing? We also need to look at what recommendations we have for the next customer survey. Are we taking advantage of Compass' ability to create effective performance measures for our organization? And, finally, what performance measures would be effective and helpful for Compass? We may not have time to tackle all of this, but at least we should look at the last question.

Owners: Alison, Scott, Joe, John Nordbo, Anne & possibly Matt Dull (PhD student from UW PoliSci)

Task: Develop a communications plan. Think about presence on the WEB. Monthly one-page summary, BHO newsletter, Monthly Secretary's Office report. Who is our audience?

Owners: Alison and John.

<p>Timeline</p>	<p>Small groups will work together to further define their tasks and will share/communicate their findings (via e-mail) to other Advisory Team members before our January 9-10 meeting.</p> <p>BHO does not have the staff to do a full blown statewide launch by Spring 2002. Fall 2002 may be more reasonable. Therefore, we would want to aim for the end of February / Early March to begin creating an Implementation Plan.</p> <p>Decision: The January meeting should produce a full set of draft recommendations. Our documentation should explain why we considered and didn't select other options, but we should have one recommendation. We will consider everything, including how often we collect the data.</p> <p>Decision: In order to give us enough time to give our draft recommendations to the SPO Managers for feedback, and to incorporate their suggestions in another meeting after our January one, the Advisory Team members have all agreed to stay on for an additional month or two to finish this work.</p>
<p>Draft List of Advisory Team Products</p> <p>What we should have done by the end of our January meeting.</p>	<p>We began the meeting with a draft list of products: things to have done by the end of the January meeting. We went through and made sure we had addressed all of them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Channel for public input/citizen priorities. See “Voice of the customer” above. ○ DTD Thumbs up or down. See “Developing a simple explanation” and “timeline” above. ○ County understanding and buy in. We seem to have this so far. We will need to make sure that our communications continue to strengthen this. ○ Recommendations for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Deficiency thresholds, reporting measures, scoring scale, features, elements, weights, objectives. Standards Team will address this. ● Reports: what to whom. In our January meeting, we can look at feedback from the reports sent out, and make a decision. ● Time of year/frequency of ratings. <p>Decision: Fall, all counties same 4-8 week time frame (Sept – Oct). Annually for at least the first 4 to 5 years to build a baseline of information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Who should rate? <p>Decision: Patrol Superintendents and Area Assistants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Training Use recommendations from Deb Laurel. ● Ratings manual. The final standards will be developed by the Standards Team. When DTD has made its decision, Alison will work with graphic design on the final product, which may be pocket size, like the PONTIS manual. ● Whether to include pavement. See “pavement data” above. ● Data to collect per segment See “other data” above.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Data to integrate</i> See “other databases” above.• <i>IT System</i> See “IT system” above.• <i>Continuity Plan (for team knowledge)</i> To be discussed at our January meeting.• <i>Communication Plan (for pilot results and recommendations)</i> See “communications plan” above.• <i>Timeline for statewide rollout</i> Develop in January.• <i>Performance Measures for Program? For objectives?</i> See “voice of the customer” above.• <i>Resources involved (time and dollars).</i> See “time and dollar resources” above.
--	--